

Applicant: Michael Kowalchik, *et al.*

U.S.S.N.: 10/731,622

Filing Date: December 9, 2003

EMC Docket No.: EMC-01-102CIP1

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached sheet of drawings includes a formal version of Fig. 13.

Applicant: Michael Kowalchik, *et al.*  
U.S.S.N.: 10/731,622  
Filing Date: December 9, 2003  
EMC Docket No.: EMC-01-102CIP1

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 21, 2008, applicants respectfully request reconsideration. In the Office Action, claims 30-32, 34-43, 45 and 47-50 were rejected. By this amendment, claims 30-32, 34-43, 45 and 47-50 have been canceled and claims 51-64 have been added canceled. Accordingly, after entrance of this amendment, claims 51-64 are pending in this application.

#### Drawing Objection

Figure 13 was objected to as being informal. Accordingly, a replacement sheet including a formal version of Fig. 13 is attached to this response.

#### Objection to the Specification

The specification was objected to for the following reasons:

(A) The status of applications mentioned in the specification needed to be amended to include the appropriate patent numbers. Accordingly, the specification has been so amended.

(B) The title of the invention was deemed not descriptive. Accordingly, the title has been amended.

(C) The specification failed to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The amendment to the claims has rendered this objection moot.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 35, 36, 43, 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The amendment to the claims has rendered this objection moot.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 30-32, 34, 37-42, 45, 49 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Thomas. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 30-32, 34, 37-42, 45, 49 and 50 have been canceled, without prejudice. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been rendered moot.

Applicant: Michael Kowalchik, *et al.*

U.S.S.N.: 10/731,622

Filing Date: December 9, 2003

EMC Docket No.: EMC-01-102CIP1

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 35, 36, 43, 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 35, 36, 43, 47 and 48 have been canceled, without prejudice. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been rendered moot.

**New Claims**

Claims 51-64 have been added to further claim the applicants' contribution to the art.

The applicant's respectfully disagree with the examiner's statement that the disclosure does not explain how the various disk-emulating solid state memories are able to function as a RAID system. Since the RAID scheme is carried out by the controller, it does not matter what type of memory device the controller is writing to. See page 9, lines 5-9. Applicants assert that, upon a thorough reading of the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to implement a RAID scheme in connection with non-volatile memory devices.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants assert that claims 51-64 are allowable and respectfully request favorable reconsideration.

In the event the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (508) 293-7835.

Please charge all fees occasioned by this submission to Deposit Account No. 05-0889.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9-22-2008

/scott a. ouellette/

Scott A. Ouellette, Esq. (Reg. No. 38,573)

Attorney for Applicants

EMC Corporation

Office of General Counsel

176 South Street

Hopkinton, MA 01748

Telephone: (508) 293-7835

Facsimile: (508) 293-7189